

28W



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,387	09/24/2003	Ralph Baran	BARAN	3930
20151	7590	08/19/2005	EXAMINER	
HENRY M FEIEREISEN, LLC 350 FIFTH AVENUE SUITE 4714 NEW YORK, NY 10118			LEE, DOUGLAS S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2125	

DATE MAILED: 08/19/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
OICE/IAF
OCT 04 2005

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/669,387

Applicant(s)

BARAN ET AL.

Examiner

Douglas S. Lee

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 24 September 2003 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/24/03.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: Semiconductor switches 33 is not labeled in the drawing mentioned in the specification page 9. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2125

3. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

4. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by Winzenz et al. (US Pat. #4,977,510) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Winzenz et al. (US Pat. #4,977,510) in view of Hagiwara (US Pat. # 6,684,707).

Regarding claim 1, Winzenz et al. disclose a rotating device (see fig. 1, element 14) presume to have a spindle with a clamping device for holding a tool and a spindle motor for rotating the spindle a converter unit supplying power to the spindle motor, said converter unit including gate-turnoff power semiconductors (see fig. 4, elements 178, 182 or 218 or 222), at least one oscillation sensor located proximate to the spindle (see fig. 1, element 18), a balancing device comprising at least one actuator (see fig. 1, element 34) for compensating an imbalance in the spindle, and a control device (see fig. 1, element 54) with a processor (see fig. 1, element 60) executing a balancing program implemented in software and integrated in the control device, said control device receiving imbalance signals from the at least one oscillation sensor and computing first control signals for the gate-turnoff power semiconductors of the converter unit from a defined relationship between a predetermined desirable rotation speed and a measured

Art Unit: 2125

or computed actual rotation speed, said control device further computing second control signals for actuating the at least one actuator to compensate the imbalance of the tool.

Regarding claims 2-7, these claims are rejected for the same reasons applied above rejected claims.

The sole difference between claim 1 and Winzenz et al. is whether the rotating device of Winzenz et al. has a spindle with a clamping device for holding a tool, and a spindle motor for rotating the spindle. The examiner believes that the rotating device of Winzenz et al. implicatively has those features. Any event Hagiwara clearly discloses a spindle with a clamping device for holding a tool, and a spindle motor for rotating the spindle. It is well known in the art to have a spindle with clamping device and a spindle motor in the rotating device as demonstrated in Hagiwara. Thus it would have been obvious one skilled in the art to have such features in Winzenz et al. to balance the unbalanced position of the rotating device.

Regarding claims 2-7, these claims are rejected for the same reasons applied above rejected claims.

Conclusion

1. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner Douglas Lee, whose telephone number is (571) 272-3745. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard, can be reached on (571) 272-3749 or via e-mail addressed to [leo.picard@uspto.gov]. The fax number for this Group is (571) 273-8300. Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [doug.lee@uspto.gov].

All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees do not engage in Internet communications where there exists a possibility that sensitive information could be identified or exchanged unless the record includes a properly

Application/Control Number: 10/669,387

Page 5


Art Unit: 2125

signed express waiver of the confidentiality requirements of 35 U.S.C. 122. This is more clearly set forth in the Interim Internet Usage Policy published in the Official Gazette of the Patent and Trademark on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist

Douglas Lee


8/16/2005



LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

Form PTO-1449

U.S. Department of Commerce
Patent and Trademark Office

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION

Attorney's Docket No.

BARAN

Applicant

RALPH BARAN et al.

Appl. No.

Filing Date

Group

Examiner

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

Examiner Initial	Document Number	Date	Name	Class	Subclass	Filing Date, if appropriate
AZ	4,977,510	12-11-1990	Winzens et al.			
AZ	5,240,358	08-31-1993	Hackett et al.			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

	Document Number	Date	Country	Class	Subclass	Translation
AZ	DE 100 17 014 A1	10-18-2001	Germany			no
	DE 32 14 233 C2	10-20-1983	Germany			no
	DE 34 08 352 C2	09-19-1985	Germany			no
	DE 42 15 723 A1	11-18-1993	Germany			no
AZ	DE 197 17 835 A1	10-29-1998	Germany			no

OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)

Examiner:

Douglas A. Lutz

Date considered:

8/12/05

*Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.

Notice of References Cited	Application/Control No. 10/669,387	Applicant(s)/Patent Under Reexamination BARAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Douglas S. Lee	Art Unit 2125	Page 1 of 1

U.S. PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Name	Classification
	A	US-6,684,707	02-2004	Hagiwara, Hiroyuki	73/660
	B	US-4,977,510	12-1990	Winzenz et al.	701/124
	C	US-5,240,358	08-1993	Hackett et al.	409/141
	D	US-5,700,116	12-1997	Cobb, Jr., William T.	409/141
	E	US-66188646	09-2003	Dyer	700/279
	F	US-			
	G	US-			
	H	US-			
	I	US-			
	J	US-			
	K	US-			
	L	US-			
	M	US-			

FOREIGN PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Document Number Country Code-Number-Kind Code	Date MM-YYYY	Country	Name	Classification
	N					
	O					
	P					
	Q					
	R					
	S					
	T					

NON-PATENT DOCUMENTS

*		Include as applicable: Author, Title Date, Publisher, Edition or Volume, Pertinent Pages)
	U	
	V	
	W	
	X	

*A copy of this reference is not being furnished with this Office action. (See MPEP § 707.05(a).)
Dates in MM-YYYY format are publication dates. Classifications may be US or foreign.

0004205065 AUG 19 2005
MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 22314



P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450
IF UNDELIVERABLE RETURN IN TEN DAYS
OFFICIAL BUSINESS

AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

RTS
RETURN TO SENDER

☐ A ☐ S

☐ INSUFFICIENT ADDRESS
☒ ATTEMPTED NOT KNOWN
☐ NO SUCH NUMBER/STREET
☐ UNABLE TO FORWARD AS ADDRESSED
☐ OTHER

USPTO MAIL CENTER

RECEIVED
OCT 03 2005
USPTO MAIL CENTER

